Some Revelations From Our Military, Pps. 2-3

Suppose Not Negroes But Men of Property Were Being Beaten in Mississippi?

Of course we don't mean it seriously. We're merely putting it forward as a classroom exercise in jurisprudence. But let us suppose it was not the rights of Negroes but the rights of property which were menaced in Mississippi. Let us suppose that, thanks to a sudden disappearance of racism, poor whites and Negroes had suddenly united and elected their own men to the State government, replacing even the Sheriffs and the police officers. And suppose that these new law enforcement officers began to harass, to beat, to shoot and occasionally to kill men of property on one excuse or another—failure to pay minimum wages on the plantations, or failure to provide fair accounting in mills and stores. Suppose that when property owners tried to demonstrate police dogs were set upon them. Suppose that when they tried to appeal to the Civil Rights Commission in Washington, the Mississippi legislature passed special laws (like Sections 2155.4, 2155.5 and 2155.6 enacted in 1960) making it a crime punishable by five years in jail to make false statements to any Federal investigator, providing that in such prosecutions the two-witness rule for perjury would be suspended and one witness would be enough for conviction, and applying this sanction even to immaterial statements (that is, any inconsequential slip of the tongue). Suppose the Attorney General had timidly refused to allow the Civil Rights Commission to hold public hearings in Mississippi lest this disturb the atmosphere! Suppose bombs had been thrown, not into some poor NAACP or CORE office, but into (forgive the expression) A BANK. Suppose the Civil Rights Commission in desperation had then called on the President and the Congress to suspend all Federal aid to Mississippi until it agreed to safeguard fundamental rights guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. Q. would this suggestion evoke a shush-shush of legalistic horror from the liberal pundits of the great newspapers? Or would the U.S. Army take over Mississippi tomorrow?

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XI, NO. 10 APRIL 29, 1963 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

"To Live As One Family" — John XXIII

A cultivated Roman from the better days of the Antonines, come suddenly back to life, would be delighted by the Pope's "Pacem in Terris." He would be enchanted to find that this obscure neo-Jewish Gnostic cult of the Christians, with their familiar myth of the God re-arisen each spring, had preserved for two millennia the humane traditions of Roman Stoic philosophy and, best of all, the great creative idea of Roman law: a universal empire, enforcing the peace throughout the civilized world, on the basis of a common citizenship open to all from Gibraltar to the Black Sea, in Rome, the mystic City which became a world and gave it several centuries of tranquillity. A kind of new Pax Romana is the Pope's plea.

No "Just" Nuclear War

The rich and crowded pages of this great document contain much that is revolutionary for Catholic doctrine, notably its abandonment of talk about "just war" and "unjust war" for the rejection altogether of nuclear war, and the new tolerance it breathes for other sects, abandoning the older Catholic idea (so like the Communist) that "error has no rights." The encyclical must also have a massive impact on Italian and world politics by its new attitude toward co-existence, in the former supporting that "opening to the Left" which can alone give Italy a firm majority and a sure course of social reform, in the latter pointing the way to a modus vivendi for East and West.

But none of these momentous shifts, not even the Pope's call for disarmament and a nuclear test ban, equal in importance his healing proposal for a new world community. Technology, the Pope says, is more and more forcing men

(Continued on Page Four)

Two Tails Which Wag Their Dogs

Newspaper editors must have been tantalized, during Nixon's speech to them, by a feeling that somewhere they had heard all this before. If on returning home they check the clippings in their "morgues" they will see where this Twilight Zone feeling originated. The speech was a replay of the 1962 campaign when Ike, Nixon and Dulles were going to "unleash" Chiang (only to put the leash quietly on him again soon after taking office) and to substitute liberation for containment (only to tell the East Germans in 1953 and the Hungarians in 1956 to contain themselves).

Eight years later, it was the turn of the Democrats to accuse the Republicans of being too cautious. Nixon now is saying what Kennedy said in 1960. Then Kennedy wanted action on Cuba, and Nixon was shaking his head over such irresponsibility. Now Nixon, always a man of principle, seems to think he could win in 1964 by reversing roles and shifting sides. He told the press he feels the GOP could win on the very same issues as in 1960 "because turning those around, President Kennedy will now be on the defensive." Anything for a vote. The "ins" are sobered by power. The "outs" exploit frustration.

China and Cuba play similar roles on both sides. The China Lobby there accuses Khrushchev of being soft on capitalism as the Cuba Lobby here accuses Kennedy of being soft on Communism. Castro in his interview with Le Monde threatened to box Khrushchev's ears; Miro Cardona has just boxed Kennedy's. The common fear which alone unites all otherwise irreconcilable Chinese and Cubans is of a settlement between U.S. and USSR. That would end the ability of the Sino-Cuban tail to wag the dog in the politics of both the big Powers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These Nightmare Glimpses of the Military Mind in Action Explain Why . . .

The selections on these two pages from the just published testimony on the 1964 Defense Dept. budget (Pt. 2) before the House Appropriations Committee may help us understand better why the Pope spoke so urgently in his peace message:

Mr. [Geo. H.] MAHON (D. Tex): General, what is your thinking in regard to the development of a 100-megaton bomb? We apparently are not interested in developing this weapon. The Soviet Union has boasted of having the large bombs and the Soviet Union has actually tested a much larger weapon than we have. . . .

Gen. [David M.] SHOUP (Commandant, US Marines): I think it is just as important that we have one if they have it. . . .

Mr. MAHON: What would you say to the argument that if we have say 100 megatons in 10 separate missiles that it would be more effective in devastation and deterrent than just say one 100-megaton bomb.

Gen. SHOUP: When you get into this kind of bomb, shooting from 100 to 200 miles high—and to date no one knows how to stop one of them. Some of these days, hopefully, the U.S. will find out how to shoot down those other things that have come down through the atmosphere, but the bomb I am talking about doesn't have to come down through the atmosphere. It will burn the place up without it. (pp. 339-40)

Just A Couple Over New York and New England

Mr. MAHON: Would a 100-megaton weapon in our possession and operational be a deterrent, in your judgment General?

Gen. Curtis E. LEMAY (USAF Chief of Staff): I think it would. * * *

Secretary [Eugene M.] ZUCKERT (of the Air Force): The deterrence is a matter of trying to judge the other fellow's state of mind. If a 100-megaton weapon—the Soviets have it— make them feel better but on the other hand they are still going to be concerned about what kind of damage they are going to receive. I do not think the kind of damage they are going to receive is determined by whether or not we have a 100-MT bomb or a few 100-MT bombs.

Mr. MAHON: A couple of 100-megaton bombs detonated in a high burst where they could not be very well intercepted might immobilize the New England area, New York and New England. (p. 446)

Faith in Counter-Force Evaporates

Mr. MAHON: I would like to ask Admiral Anderson about his interpretation of counterforce strategy.

Admiral Geo W. ANDERSON (Chief of Naval Operations): Off the record. (Discussion off the record).

We Never Burn 'Em Up Unless—

Gen. LeMAY (USAF Chief of Staff): If you have to go in there and there is cover around where weapons could be concealed that could fire on the choppers (helicopters), you should beat it up with your fixed wing fighters before they go in, at the same time covering them until they get on the ground. You can do this with fixed wing airplanes that have the capability for accurate fire and delivery of heavy munitions. YOU CAN CARRY QUITE A LOAD (our emphasis—IFS). If you try to do this with the chopper, it is not a good firing platform. You cannot hit anything with it. They cannot carry much of a load of weapons. So, this is not the way to do it.

Mr. [Dan'l J.] FLOOD (D. Pa.): Now you have this problem. We are going in to Point A. I have guerrillas and these Reds all around the area. My intelligence reports where they are. They are practically and traditionally tied in to local villages and local people. Now you are back to the question which has been appearing in the newspaper all week. I have to go in there. I have to go in tonight. Are you going to go in, as in these pictures you showed me here the other day, and clobber everything and everybody with napalm and rockets and .50-caliber machine guns, kill everybody and burn everything, so the choppers put down and all they do is have a nice hot mess because everybody is dead?

Gen. Le MAY: No; it is not advocated to bomb indiscriminately. It is only those targets that have been clearly identified as enemy targets.

—1964 Defense Budget Hse hearings, pps. 483-4.

Mr. Wm. E. MINSHALL (R. Ohio): What happens to the hardened bases?

Admiral ANDERSON: Off the record. (Discussion off record).

Mr. MINSHALL: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, for interrupting, but this hardened target concept has been explained to us by Mr. McNamara and other experts, and you are an expert, and not one of them has come here, Mr. McNamara included, and said that we could knock them all out. They have still said that we would suffer untold damage.

Admiral ANDERSON: That is right.

Mr. MINSHALL: What makes you think the Soviet Union is just going to target on our military targets?

Admiral ANDERSON: Off the record.

Mr. MINSHALL: That is a wild concept, in my book.

Mr. MAHON: Of course if there are Soviet submarines at sea that can launch medium-range ballistic missiles you cer-

Gen. Taylor Says India, Not China, Started Last Autumn's Border Fighting

Mr. [Robert L. F.] SIKES (D. Fla.): Let me talk about Red China and the Indian operation. Did the Indians actually start this military operation?

Gen. [Maxwell D.] TAYLOR (Chr'm, Joint Chiefs of Staff): They were edging forward in the disputed area; yes, sir.

(Discussion off the record).

Mr. SIKES: Is the area of the neutral zone on territory that was formerly claimed by India or claimed by China?

Gen. TAYLOR: In most cases claimed by both.

Mr. SIKES: Where is it with relation to the generally accepted international boundary?

Gen. TAYLOR: That is hard to say because there is no generally accepted international boundary. I am sorry to be vague about this, but I can assure you that I spent several hours trying to find out where the McMahon line is. Actually, you find the maps differ on this. The terrain is so terribly rugged, there has been no accurate mapping and no accurate boundary lines or markers placed.

Mr. SIKES: Is the proposed neutral zone generally within territory which was occupied prior to all of this activity by Indian or Chinese forces?

Gen. TAYLOR: Most of it was unoccupied by anybody. General Hall, are you an expert on this subject?

Gen. HALL: Yes, sir. I would say in general it was occupied by neither force, but that the NEFA [North East Frontier Agency] was occupied predominantly by Indian forces. One thing I think it is very important to point out is that the Chinese Nationalists, when they were in control of China, did not recognize this line either. So it is not a question of the fact it is a Chinese Communist line vis-a-vis an Indian line. It is an Indian line that has never been recognized by either the Chinese Communists or the Nationalists.

—Dept. of Defense 1964 appropr. hearings before House Approp Com, Pt. 2, released April 19, pps. 9-10.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . The Pope Spoke So Urgently of the Need for Peace and Disarmament

tainly wouldn't expect to take all of them out?

Admiral ANDERSON: No sir.

Mr. MAHON: What does counterforce strategy mean to you?

Admiral ANDERSON: Off the record. (pps. 340-41)

Pushing Hard to Create New Monsters

Mr. [Gerald R.] FORD (R. Mich.): I detect a tendency on the part of some people to accept the philosophy that mutual deterrence or nuclear stalemate is inevitable regardless of what we do dollarwise, programwise, or otherwise. Do you accept the philosophy that mutual deterrence or nuclear stalemate is ineviltable?

Gen. LEMAY: No, I do not accept that philosophy at all. . . . In other words, if we stop trying, we certainly are not going to succeed in defending ourselves. . . .

Secretary ZUCKERT: I do not think anybody in the Pentagon in a position of responsibility believes we are going to get some kind of balanced situation that is going to perpetuate itself. That is why all of us—Navy, Army, Air Force—are pushing at these technological frontiers all the time to find out what may be the key to the next weapon system or the next development that will upset any balance. (pps. 580-81).

Chemical and Biological War

Mr. [Robert L. F.] SIKES (D. Fla.): In the present world situation, where there seems to be an effort to find a way to win wars without resorting to nuclear strikes . . . there is a possibility that chemical and biological materials will play a much more important part than they have played heretofore. That would particularly be true if the Russians were to demonstrate a very pronounced capability in that field. Does that possibility concern the Department of the Army?

Secretary [Cyrus R.] VANCE (*of the Army*): Yes, it does concern the Department of the Army and to that end sir, we are procuring additional munitions during the coming years which would increase rather substantially our capability to deliver chemical and bacteriological materials on target. In addition, we are increasing the funds for chemical and biological research and development so as to press forward in new types of weapons which may be able to be used in such a situation. . . .

Mr. SIKES: Does intelligence tell us what the Russians are really doing in this field.

Secretary VANCE: Our intelligence indicates that they are devoting considerable attention to it. . . .

Mr. SIKES: How far are we going in the way of warning system and in providing a gas mask and similar defensive measures?

On Cuba As Soviet Base

Mr. [Jamie L.] WHITTEN (D. Miss.): With Cuba being a Communist stronghold in the Western Hemisphere doesn't it make an ideal base for further steps forward into South and Central America. . . ?

Gen. Maxwell D. TAYLOR (Chr'm, Jt. Chiefs of Staff): I would say that Cuba is an island surrounded by seas which we control absolutely: that any movement of men, material and things of that sort from Cuba would be known by us.

—1964 Defense Budget, Hse App. hearings, pps. 14-15

Gen. [Earle G.] WHEELER (US Army Chief of Staff): They are in the hands of the troops, but we need better types.

Mr. SIKES: I would assume the civilian population was almost completely unprotected in these fields?

Secretary VANCE: That is right. (pps. 188-90).

Not A Few Russians in Cuba

Gen. SHOUP: I am not much of an expounder, but we seem to have so many words today about some Russian forces that are about 90 miles away. I think we ought to think about what we are going to do when they are 3¼ miles away in submarines with Polaris-type armament. And it is going to come to pass. What are we going to do when they put tremendous-sized nuclear weapons in satellites or even in bombers? When you might have to get but three or four of them over this continent to burn the whole darn thing up.

These are the serious problems that are confronting this nation, more than a few Russians down in Cuba. (p. 339)

End of the White Race

Gen. SHOUP: Now, about the casualty business. I have said for the last 2 years that when the nuclear exchange of the magnitude that is possible occurs—and there will be even greater capability later—that we will have not millions but 700 to 800 million dead. Although I did not give him the figures, that is exactly the figures Khrushchev used in the past month. I have no communication with him nor he with me, but that is exactly the same figure.

We are then looking at a situation where we have the white race or the Caucasion race—and I don't know whether it would be good to eliminate the white race from the face of the earth or not but I am convinced that a nuclear exchange will do it. Within a matter of years afterward the white race is finished. There will be a little bit of New Zealand and Australia left but you have plenty of yellows and browns to take that over in a matter of a few years. (p. 337)

Admiral Anderson Dismisses Submarine Fears in That New Cuban Fishing Base

Mr. [Geo. H.] MAHON (D. Tex.): Now I would like to talk about a matter involving the Cuban fishing fleet and the use of ports, the possible use of ports in Cuba by the Soviet fishing fleet and by the Soviet submarine fleet. Will you give us the picture on that?

Admiral [Geo. W.] ANDERSON (Chief of Naval Operations): Yes, sir; I will. On the 25th of September, just before the outbreak of the Cuban crisis, the Cubans and the Soviets signed an agreement for the construction of a fishing port in Havana for Cuban and Soviet use.

On Jan. 17, 1963, the Cubans announced that the planning was complete and the construction for the fishing port would start in February 1963, with completion scheduled for December 1963. The announcement reiterated Cuban sovereignty over this facility.

In July 1962, Soviet fishing boats arrived in Havana and have since operated in the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean. They have been joined by others, bringing the total involved to ———. [Number cut by censor—IFS].

In addition, three fish factory ships have called at Cuban ports, probably bringing in fish from the Soviet Union. The Cubans have bought five fishing boats from Japan, three of which already have been delivered to Cuba.

Cuba has a significant shortage of protein in their diet, dating from the slaughter in 1961 of breeding stocks to replace imports from the U.S. The establishment of the fishing fleet in Cuba is an efficient means of supplementing the source of the protein in the diet. The Soviet Union is helping to support the Cuban economy. However, there are no additional gains to the Soviet Union.

(Discussion off the record).

Admiral ANDERSON: To date, we have seen no evidence that Soviet submarines have operated from Cuban ports. We also believe that if they went into Cuban ports we would find out about it very quickly.

—Pt. 2 1964 Defense Approp House hearings, p. 349

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Bands of Robbers" — But Now Armed With Nuclear Thunderbolt

(Continued from Page One)

"to work together and live as one family." In this context the nation-state system is obsolete. The problems of security and peace have grown too complex to be solved within it. Not lack of good will, the Pope sees, but "structural defects" in the existing order hinder their solution. "Today," His Holiness pleads, "the universal common good poses problems of world-wide dimensions, which cannot be adequately tackled or solved except by the efforts of public authorities . . . in a position to operate in an effective manner on a worldwide basis." This would not supersede but supplement existing political structures, creating law in their relations. Otherwise, as he quotes from St. Augustine, "What are kingdoms without justice but bands of robbers?" And those bands of robbers are now armed with the nuclear thunderbolt. . . .

The Only Vision That Can Save Us

This is the Vision which can alone save us: the conception of one family, one race, one planet, one universal creed of human brotherhood broad enough to encompass us all, based on a Declaration of Human Rights enforcible everywhere. Within this framework of law, all is possible: a nuclear test ban, disarmament, reunification of divided countries from Germany to Korea, a new era of creative co-existence without fear or hatred which must lead ultimately to a common human society, both socialistic and spiritually free. Otherwise we are all on a dead-end street.

The Pope says that the same moral law "which covers relations betwen individual human beings serves also to regulate the relations of political communities with one another." This, unfortunately, describes what should be, not what is. Between man and man, resort to murder is not allowed. Not so among Nation States, where murder is the final sanction, and preparation for it the main business of the State.

To kill or be killed is the higher law of nations, and this makes them moral monsters. "It would be absurd," the Roman Pontiff says, "even to imagine that men could surrender their own human attributes, or be compelled to do so, by the very fact of their appointment to public office." It may be absurd, but it is true. This is exactly what appointment to the highest office does in the existing international jungle. The No. 1 man in the White House or the Kremlin is put into a position where he may feel compelled to do what he would never do as a moral individual, give the signal to consign hundreds of millions of human beings to a final hell —as could have happened last October over Cuba, if one man hadn't backed down and another had pressed the button. Power to murder, not morality, determined the outcome.

The Nation State system dehumanizes the ruler and the ruled. To make us feel morally absolved for preparing mass cremation, we create caricatures of our adversaries. They are made to appear not our brothers but less-than-human, there "Reds", here "capitalists." In this lawless world we bear the mark of our ancestor Cain and are compelled to go on killing our brother. The Bomb forces a new answer, and His Holiness offers us a new one, which is an old one, but with a new urgency and in a new form. *April 23*

Tributes We Could Do Without

It seemed as though everybody this year celebrated the anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto. The President sent a message to a gathering in Carnegie Hall. The Poles treated it as a solemn national holiday. It was marked even in Moscow. Everybody used it for their own purposes: in Germany to show they were contrite, in Poland to make anti-German propaganda, in Russia to overcome the bad taste abroad of its stale anti-Semitism. But of all these mourning powers, not a single one is acting to prevent the drift toward war in the Middle East. Bonn finds all kinds of legal excuses for inaction when Israel protests that German scientists are building rockets for Egypt. Averell Harriman fatuously assures a New York Congressman that the U.S. cannot interfere because if the Germans weren't building these rockets, the Russians would! The Arabs fear the Israeli are manufacturing a nuclear weapon. The Israelis fear ex-Nazis are preparing Egypt for another try at that "final solution." A united Arab onslaught on Israel, possibly escalating into a wider war, could still be forestalled, Arab-Israeli reconciliation sought. East and West mourn the Warsaw Ghetto. But neither will lift a finger to prevent a new and greater tragedy for the Jewish people.

We'll Send Free Copies of This to Friends If You Send Stamped Addressed Long Envelopes

I.F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

4/29/63

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

I.F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every other Monday at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED